

ANARCHY 59



TWO SHILLINGS OR THIRTY CENTS IN THIS ISSUE: THE WHITE PROBLEM

Contents of No. 59

January 1966

| | | |
|--|----------------------|----|
| The white problem | John Ellerby | 1 |
| To hell with liberalism | Albert Meltzer | 3 |
| Black marks in the classroom | Philip Ward | 8 |
| The white problem in Rhodesia | Jeremy Westall | 12 |
| Savagery starts at home | A. S. Neill | 22 |
| More heat than light | Colin MacInnes | 25 |
| Martin Buber and the voluntary society | Roy Walker | 26 |
| Observations on ANARCHY 57 | Stan Cohen, Ian Vine | 29 |
| Cover by | Rufus Segar | |

Other issues of ANARCHY

VOLUME 1, 1961: 1. Sex-and-Violence, Galbraith*; 2. Worker's control†; 3. What does anarchism mean today?; 4. Deinstitutionalisation; 5. Spain 1936†; 6. Cinema†; 7. Adventure playgrounds†; 8. Anthropology; 9. Prison; 10. MacInnes, Industrial decentralisation.

VOLUME 2, 1962: 11. Paul Goodman, A. S. Neill; 12. Who are the anarchists? 13. Direct action; *14. Disobedience; *15. The work of David Wills; 16. Ethics of anarchism, Africa; 17. Towards a lumpenproletariat; 18. Comprehensive schools; 19. Theatre: anger and anarchy; 20. Non-violence, Freud; 21. Secondary modern; 22. Cranston's dialogue on anarchy.

VOLUME 3, 1963: 23. Housing, squatters, do-it-yourself; 24. Community of Scholars; 25. Technology, cybernetics; 26. CND, Salesmanship, Thoreau; 27. Youth; 28. The future of anarchism; 29. The Spies for Peace Story; 30. The community workshop; 31. Self-organising systems, Beatniks; the State; 32. Crime; 33. Alex Comfort's anarchism†; 34. Science fiction, Workless teens.

VOLUME 4, 1964: 35. House and home; 36. Arms of the law; 37. Why I won't vote; 38. Nottingham; 39. Homer Lane; 40. Unions and workers' control; 41. The land; 42. Indian anarchism; 43. Parents and teachers; 44. Transport; 45. Anarchism and Greek thought; 46. Anarchism and the historians.

VOLUME 5, 1965: 47. Towards freedom in work; 48. Lord of the flies; 49. Automation; 50. The anarchist outlook; 51. Blues, R'n'b, Pop, Folk; 52. Limits of pacifism; 53. After school; 54. Buber, Landauer, Muhsam; 55. Mutual aid and social evolution; 56. A man's world.

PLEASE NOTE: Issues 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 33 are out of print.

Some ANARCHY Distributors

Birmingham College of Commerce: Peter Neville; Bishop Otter College: G. J. Smith; Chorley Training College: Alistair Rattray; Lancaster University: Christine Segalini; Leeds University: G. R. Pearce, 3 Marlboro Grove, Leeds 2. Cambridge: John Needle, Gonville & Caius College.

Leicester: Malcolm Norman c/o Students' Union; Manchester University: Socialist Society Bookstall; Coleg Harlech: Michael Harris; Keele University: Marshall Colman, Students' Union; Durham University: Jeremy Hawden, College of the Venerable Bede.

Subscribe to ANARCHY

Single copies 2s. (30c.). Annual Subscription (12 issues) 26s. (\$3.50). By airmail 47s. (\$7.00). Joint annual subscription with FREEDOM the anarchist weekly (which readers of ANARCHY will find indispensable) 42s. (\$6.00). Cheques, P.O.s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, 17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6, England. Tel.: RENown 3736.

ANARCHY 59 (Vol 6 No 1) JANUARY 1966

I

The white problem

THE PROBLEM OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND RACIAL PREJUDICE presents a different face in different countries. In Rhodesia, discussed in this issue of ANARCHY by Jeremy Westall, who has lived and worked in that country, the question is simply one of how long 217,000 people of European origin think they can dominate nearly four million non-Europeans. In Britain the question is that of why 820,000 "coloured" people constitute a problem in a country of 54 millions. Just as in Germany there was really no "Jewish problem", only a German problem, so in Britain there is no "colour problem", only a white problem.

Students of the white problem and its solution differ widely in their interpretations. In this issue of ANARCHY opinions vary from Albert Meltzer's opinion that the problem is simply that of a class-divided society—that racial tensions will always exist in a society of haves and have-nots, and that liberal-minded people who want to ameliorate the situation, are simply deceiving themselves since they attack symptoms and not causes, to A. S. Neill's conclusion that it is in fact authoritarian methods of child-rearing which produce hatred instead of a "natural charity and tolerance".

A few years ago the Oxford City Council demolished the walls which had been built across two streets twenty-five years earlier by an estate development company in order to segregate their private housing estate from the council house tenants on the other side. The City Council first demolished them in 1938 but had to build them again after losing the resultant legal battle. One of them was knocked down in 1943 by the army and re-erected by the War Office. Finally, in 1959, the Council succeeded in buying the walls for about £1,000 in order to demolish them.

This story reminds us that prejudice is not the monopoly of the poor and ignorant, and that it is not confined to "race relations". The prejudiced person is almost invariably one who sees the "out-group" as "in some way or other constituting a threat to his own personal security and status". The work of Adorno and his colleagues in America (*The Authoritarian Personality*) and of Eysenck in this country (*The Psychology of Politics*) suggests that the person who is hostile to his coloured fellow-citizens as a group, is also anti-semitic, and has a whole range of other hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitative and anti-rational attitudes which do not at first sight seem related to each other. It is difficult however to find a dividing line between people whose

prejudice is an aspect of their personality and those for whom it is merely an unthinking acceptance of popular stereotypes. No one is born prejudiced, but, as Anthony Richmond concluded in his *Colour Prejudice in Britain* (written before prejudice became endemic in this country):

"Severe prejudice is a product of basic personality traits. One of the most important functions of the home is to provide an atmosphere of love and security, in which the child can grow to view life experiences as rewarding rather than deprivational. The building up of such personalities begins at birth and continues throughout life. Radical changes may be necessary in traditional parent/child relationships if adults with balanced integrated personalities are to be created who can face difficulties without undue anxiety, and who do not need to resort to violent prejudices in order to maintain their own self-esteem. Clearly the development of a secure home background must be accompanied by a social system in which there is a minimum of avoidable occasions for fear: unemployment, war and all the other causes of fear in social life must be removed if a society free of prejudice is to be created."

No one can doubt that this is so. The relation between insecurity and prejudice was succinctly illustrated in an American investigation by correlating the rise and fall of the price of cotton with the annual number of lynchings. The outbreaks of racial violence in Nottingham and Notting Hill in 1958 coincided with the rise in unemployment. Anthony Richmond's study of prejudice against West Indians in Liverpool led him to the hypothesis that *prejudice* is a function of social and sexual status factors, but that *discrimination* tends to be governed more by economic considerations.

But we cannot, in practice, postpone attempts to reduce prejudice until all our other social and economic problems are solved, any more than we can refrain from attempting to wean the authoritarian character from his "ethnocentrism", however early in life he may have developed it. James Robb observed in his investigation of anti-semitism (*Working-Class Antisemite*) that though its connection with social and economic upheavals is too well-attested to be denied, the connection is neither simple nor direct. Certainty of employment, better housing and other social reforms, can lower its incidence "by avoiding the activation of prejudice potential in individuals whose personalities are inclined towards this reaction."

Thus it may be said that both the "economic" and the "psychological" explanations of the white problem are valid. What does the well-intentioned citizen do about it? It is perfectly true that the brunt of the assimilation of immigrants has to be borne by those who both economically and psychologically are least armed to bear it, and that consequently the only really valid thing to do about this is to change the social order. It is at the same time true that one of the chief barriers to "inter-racial understanding" is the tendency to lump people

together into groups based on stereotypes. (The stereotypes which are actually applied to West Indians, or Pakistanis are not really worth discussing because they are the almost universal in-group stereotypes of the out-group. The out-group is dirty, wants to make money without working, is endowed with some special sexual prowess, and lives only for pleasure. The same kind of stereotype applied at one time to the Irish, and then to the Poles, and then to the Italians, but these less visually obvious groups have not been "upgraded" just as the Negroes in New York were upgraded by the arrival of the Puerto Ricans.)

One thing that American experience teaches us is that propaganda has little or no effect in these circumstances. You can't sell tolerance like a soap powder. Moral persuasion is out too. Philip Ward, in this issue of ANARCHY describes graphically the difficulties facing the teacher in trying to combat racial prejudice. Certainly in stressing that the only effective work in curing inter-group tensions is on the level of individual and face-to-face groups, we have to emphasise that patronising attempts from outside to "bring the races together" for social activities, are likely to be ineffective as propaganda.

We hope in a further issue of ANARCHY to discuss those activities which stand a chance of being useful.

To hell with liberalism

ALBERT MELTZER

WHEN THE SEVENTH EARL OF SHAFESBURY DIED in 1885, hundreds of religious and philanthropic institutions were represented at his funeral in Westminster Abbey. They included any number of Ragged Schools, the Reformatory and Refuge Union, Hoxton Costers' Mission, St. James's Home for Female Inebriates, Destitute Children's Dinner Society, Female Mission to the Fallen, Gordon Memorial Fund for the Benefit of Poor Children, and so on, an impressive roll call of Victorian do-goodery. Many respectable citizens shook their heads at such philanthropy in the slums—in the manner of *Punch's* Challoner-like cartoonist they depicted the destitute Hoxton coster or the ragged child saying when he saw yet another helpful visitor—"Let's 'eave arf-a-brick at 'im". The "destitute child" or the "fallen female" may well have been pleased with their bowl of hot nourishing soup and instructive religious tract, and it may well have been better to have attended the Ragged School than no school at all, but the growth of the working-class movement is a series of metaphorical half-bricks heaved at men like Lord Shaftesbury no less than at the *Punch* gentleman-fascist ideal.

The sophistication of the present day does not permit such wonderfully expressive titles as those used in Lord Shaftesbury's day (the Ogle Mews Ragged School, the Society for the Improvement of the Condition

of the Labouring Classes). In any case, the labouring class has improved its condition by its own efforts. Philanthropy has given place to liberalism. People are enabled to do something for those "less fortunate than themselves" by joining the League for the Rights of Man, the Association for the Advancement of the Coloured People, the Committee against Racial Discrimination, the Movement for Colonial Freedom. But their language has not really changed much.

"I went into the army in 1939 because I couldn't sit by and see the Jewish people wiped out. I was opposed to war all the same."

A.B., an engineer.

"We've got to do something to help these poor devils who come over here. After all, negroes are human beings, the same as us."

C.D., Post Office clerk.

"What are we doing for the less fortunate nations?"

E.F., pacifist speaker.

My dear liberal friends, why do you not call your organisations by such names as Society for the Poor Blacks, League for the Downtrodden Jews, Union for the Betterment of the Underdeveloped Nations? (One cannot be too satirical—the last phrase is actually in use.) And why are you surprised that not only the working classes (for whom you have done so much—but then, the Guinness family did a lot for the poor people of Dublin, as Brendan Behan remarked, and the poor people of Dublin did quite a lot for the Guinness family), but also the Black Moslems and the people of Watts County, are all heaving half-bricks at you?

We were assured that when Smethwick rejected Mr. Patrick Gordon-Walker, it was a blow to human dignity and freedom, and when Leyton declined him, also, racial discrimination was apparent. Yet the half-brick sustained by Mr. Gordon-Walker may have been a lucky shot in its way. As Foreign Secretary, so right-wing a figure would have been a major disaster in handling such matters as Viet-Nam. Mr. Stewart, as locum tenens, has been bad enough, but the setback to the leading right-winger of the Party may have restrained him a little. It is unfashionable today to suggest the working class may sometimes be right. Perhaps Smethwick knew full well what it was doing in rejecting Mr. Gordon-Walker. He was, after all, not a member of any racial minority. Any so-called left-winger of the Labour Party could have retained the seat—even a right-winger with a working-class background could have retained it—even somebody like Shinwell could have kept it, despite being a Jew (which has never been an electoral liability in England), despite being 80 years old and quite as reactionary as Gordon-Walker. As a member of the Front Bench, engrossed in foreign affairs (like Viet-Nam), Gordon-Walker could and did offer nothing. But Smethwick was a "safe seat", so it did not matter. But there was some racial discontent (nobody disputes that) and so it *did* matter.

Yet even so, was Smethwick entirely wrong? Its people did not want to go on living in the slums with coloured immigrants. Why do coloured immigrants live in the slums? Because they cannot get out of them. Would anyone from Smethwick mind living in Hampstead

Garden Suburb, like the members of the Labour Front Bench, with neighbours who might be equally as black as those in Smethwick, but not quite so ubiquitous? It is easy to live in Hampstead, with an Indian doctor next door, to whom one says "Good morning" over the holly-hocks, and join CARD; it is quite a different matter to live in Smethwick and have a West Indian family over one's head playing jazz until 2 a.m. The working-class may express themselves badly on the matter. But basically what they are complaining about (in England, at least) is the conditions under which they live. It is automatically assumed by the liberal that this is the same problem that exists in the Southern States of the U.S.A., or South Africa, but it is not.

It is racialism. What is wrong with racialism? It has always been highly inconvenient both to political and to economic imperialism to find that some folk traditions could not be readily wiped out. Nationalism has always served the State, but racialism has sometimes tripped it up. By making all the people in one country citizens of one nation-State, the State has canalised their obedience: exacting tribute from them just as long as it had authority over them. Yet nationality can be exchanged like a worn-out suit; indeed, the Englishman who emigrates to a country of similar language or culture changes his nationality quicker than he wears out his suit, and by the time he is sartorially indistinguishable from his new compatriots he is probably sneering at "pommies" or "limeys" with the best of them. Folk differences, however, make it difficult for the State: the Romans found the Jews stubborn and the Celts indigestible, and the Coal Board cannot get Welsh miners to go and work in Lancashire. The American workers objected to cheap Chinese labour coming into the U.S.A. at the same time as the Chinese themselves were hounding the Manchurians out of China. It suits the State at times to call for liberalism. The U.S. today would like a little more liberalism in race relationship, without altering the economic status of the Southern Negro, but the white is too ignorant and the Negro too poor to accept this legacy of Kennedy, who was not even much of a liberal saint but the best they can offer us.

It would be very convenient for a modern liberal government if we had no differences at all. Like the ideal Chinese worker of Mao Tse Tung, clad in identical blue tunics, we could all turn up to work wherever we were sent, a nation of blue ants, industriously toiling for our masters, who could be kindly and tolerant scholars living in elegant homes, giving us the benefit of their wisdom. This is the utopia of statesmanship. They would impose it if they could. The fact, however, that liberalism still exists is an indication that sometimes the blue ants can occasionally sting. Of course anyone with a grain of working-class experience knows that racial discrimination, race hate and the like are evil things, as much as any liberal. But there are other evil things too and one depends upon the other. The housing situation is the particular one in this country, and if this had been remedied, there would have been no colour clashes any more than there were in the days when Limehouse faced a similar wave of immigration. When the housing problem eases, the problem of race relationship also eases. What causes

the colour clash? So far as England is concerned, it has nothing to do with the old imperialist attitude to the colonies. *Then*, the white sahib abroad despised all foreigners, all natives, and was convinced of his own superiority. *Now*, the people who nod musingly when some idiot chalks up "Keep Britain White" are by no means convinced of their own superiority; on the contrary they have a strong inferiority complex due to being kept down in the slums.

"They get houses, we don't . . . if I blacked my face I might get a council house . . . and XYZ, MP, said to me, I can't do anything for you, I'm too busy looking after the poor coloured workers. . . . They can get National Assistance, but if we went we wouldn't . . . etc."

That is nothing to do with old-fashioned imperialism, everything to do with a strong inferiority complex. How can the liberal call these people "fascists"? They are just frightened. This is an attitude that runs right through the decaying houses and disappears in the sunlight of better housing. It has nothing really to do with colour prejudice. (The same districts have always accepted as better the "black doctor"—usually Indian—have mixed freely with seamen of all nations and colours—and begin to accept coloured people when they mix freely at work, but particularly if their housing problem has been solved.) The tendency of liberalism is to rail at prejudice but to do nothing about the major problems. The reason for that is simple: they have abandoned the working-class struggle, if it ever interested them in the first place. As one result, they are forced to purely political solutions. Stop landladies from refusing coloured tenants! Stop incitements to race hatred! Stop snobbish Gentiles banning snobbish Jews from snobbish golf clubs! All these well-meaning organisations and their well-meaning activities are only the modern equivalent of taking round bowls of soup for the destitute child in his Ragged School. Why does the Black Moslem heave his half-brick at the worthy liberal no less than does the Notting Hill labourer in one room of a raddled house, the rest of which is occupied by a West Indian family being bled white by the mortgage so that every speck of dirt on the stairs is worth its weight in gold-dust? He is not really a Moslem in that he holds that "there is no God but God and Mohammed is his prophet and Mohammed Ali is the greatest" so much as a protest against the *tolerance* which is being shown him. Not everybody liked being placed in a ragged school either. There is not much difference between liberalism and illiberalism: one is only the reverse of the coin. Those who show toleration could equally well be intolerant; and while it is true that the more decent people are tolerant and the less decent people intolerant, as once more decent people provided soup and the less decent people said you would not be thanked for it, ingratitude must rightly be expected.

What is wanted is not the efforts of the liberal at reform, but the revolutionary approach. Those who are now abandoning the revolutionary approach may be as cynical as they wish about it. Let us change our name from anarchists to libertarians and then concentrate on

liberal reforms rather than impossible revolution!—we too will merit our share of the half-bricks if we do so. When *A.B.* went into the army, he did so because he was conscripted, and did not resist. What really had the position of the Jews in Germany to do with it? A friend in America wrote to me in 1940 more or less to this effect:

"Why reproach *G.H.* for supporting the war? What alternative is there, say for the Jews in Europe to escape Hitler? We have talked about revolution for fifty years. What will save the Jews in Warsaw now will not be that impossible revolution, it will be the victory of the democratic powers—we have to look to Churchill!"

This, however, was not the position of the Jews in Europe. *G.H.* might think that the democratic powers would help the Jews of Eastern Europe. They did not. Joel Brand found that the problems facing the Jewish Resistance was not merely that they had to fight the Nazis but that the democratic powers were of no help. When he was asked to negotiate by Eichmann, it was not a condition that he actually provided lorries to save Jews from the gas-ovens. He merely had to promise to do so. The Allies would not make such a promise despite Brand's explanation that it would be an easy one to break. The true answer came from Lord Moyne, of the Guinness family that had done so much for the poor people of Dublin: "What would we do with three million Jews if we got them?"—to which Brand could only answer despairingly, "Put them in gas ovens yourself, there is no place for them on earth".

What finally happened to the Jews in Warsaw? They rose up in an impossible revolution. The day of barricades is over, said the liberals, but they built barricades. Not just the idealistic revolutionaries built them. Old men in prayer-shawls built them; liberals built them; reactionaries built them; the normally indifferent mass rushed enthusiastically to build them. They all knew it was an impossible revolution and that it would achieve nothing whatever. But it was the only possible course. They compromised the Polish Resistance which was not very happy about the battle that went on while the crowds poured out of Polish churches from Easter service to watch. They compromised the British Government which had done its best for this poor people and allowed soup to be sent through Switzerland. The Negroes in Watts County, too, hemmed in a ghetto for the poor surrounded by opulent districts through which no public transport ran, compromised all the fine liberal-minded organisations that were prepared to do so much for them. They ran amok and burned, while Los Angeles looked on horrified—but not quite so horrified when the police took control. There was no lack of cartoonists to show that the people of Watts County had thrown half-bricks at the liberals.

Are we to imagine that the efforts of the liberals are somehow half-way houses to freedom? With Ibsen, I believe that this "damned smug compact liberal majority" that dominates the Labour and Conservative Parties is the worst enemy of freedom. We do not want people to smooth over differences and persuade everyone to live

together happily in the wormwood-ridden houses of Brixton. The more they break the place up, the better we shall all be. Of course the Cockney and the West Indian throw half-bricks alike at the good folk who tell them that they ought to live quietly together in the Stepney slums. Maybe their common reaction will lead to a common unity.

Capital punishment was a baneful and vengeful thing, but its abolition has not taken us nearer to the revolutionary policy of abolition of prisons, but further from it! Those academic sociologists who were prepared to admit that society could move towards the abolition of imprisonment are less likely to support it if it means letting murderers loose. Liberalism does not advance freedom. It seeks to define its limits. The do-gooders are pressing for coloured policemen and coloured magistrates and they think that this will be a victory for freedom. To support the case we are told what excellent recruits they would make, which is undoubtedly true. (Behan left on record what excellent prison warders the Irish Catholics were, especially towards other Irish Catholics from whom they needed to dissociate themselves!)

Fascism will never succeed in Britain. Or at least, if it does, it will be called Anti-Fascism. The only alternative appears to be insurrectionism, and if this is considered old-fashioned and outmoded let us at least go down fighting in our own plumage, the Last of the Mohicans.

In the classroom

PHILIP WARD

"There's this story my mate told me about the niggers in Brixton. One of his friends works for a bloke who lives in one of them long rows of terrace houses. One night he was sitting in his room watching the telly when he hears this knocking coming from the roof. He's a bit worried so he gets out his ladder to go up and see what's on. When he gets up in the loft, what does he see? A whole colony of niggers living up there, beds, tables, chairs, the lot, with kids all over the place. There was this family bought a house down the road see, and they moved their friends upstairs. More and more kept coming to live there so they moved right down the road, knocking holes in the walls between all the lofts . . ."

ANOTHER TALE THAT WILL BECOME EMBROIDERED and enlarged upon whenever colour in Britain is discussed. There are others more fantastic which, although they do not contain the preposterous material of the "colour-joke", do give the teller some glory as a raconteur and do, of course, contribute to, and reinforce already held attitudes. When attitudes are held in this way and are supported by a witty but callous folklore, they are particularly difficult to change because in discussion

one is no longer faced by an individual with prejudices but by an intricate and culturally supported mythology. Discussions in the classroom are difficult to handle because of this—the best story-tellers, the ones with the wittiest phrases, tend to receive status from the rest of the class because of their ability. In teaching industrial apprentices there is then an apparent danger of providing opportunities to reinforce prejudice rather than remove it, and until much more is known about the nature, the origins and the adaptability of attitudes, any thoughts about change through education may well be pessimistic ones. This is particularly the case while liberal or general studies remains the cinderella subject of further education. One hour a week, thirty seven weeks a year, even if completely devoted to discussion about colour, would be pathetically inadequate in modifying attitudes and beliefs formed in years of factory and leisure experience.

Most of the attitudes towards immigrants have been well documented, but they bear further examination and illustration from classroom experience.

A frequent reaction from the class in introducing a discussion about colour is that the teacher is easily defined as a conversionist with a missionary purpose in the classroom "trying to teach us to love the niggers"; is seen in fact as a challenge to a common group belief. This is backed by the suggestion from the class that your attitude might be different if you had to "live with them" or "work with them". This may of course be true, and if it is, then there would be real difficulties in establishing any "authority" in the discussion: there would be the same contempt as is felt for the graduate manager who attempts to control with no factory or workshop experience behind him. When you say that you have coloured friends with whom you have worked and shared digs, but that your experience has produced different conclusions from theirs, the situation changes slightly. A little hesitation and then the tinned cat food stories, the noisy party stories; that is, people begin to exchange and compare experiences, usually those which they find amusing or repulsive.

Arguments that different cultures and situations produce different, and perhaps to us bizarre and inconvenient, behaviour, carry little weight against the solid fact of feeling dislike or amusement about the way different people live. If you wear neat mod suits and your standards of dress centre on Carnaby Street, then the baggy trousered gaberdines of a rural West Indian immigrant are funny, they offend you aesthetically.

Attitudes about sexual behaviour are ambivalent. There does appear to be a lot of hostility towards mixed marriage and there is disapproval of girls who have coloured boy friends, but coloured artists are seen as sexually attractive and desirable. There seems to be little evidence, so far as evidence can be revealed by discussion, to support the "sexual envy" theory, i.e. that the Negro is genetically better equipped and is viewed as a more athletic and competent sexual rival.

That immigrants exploit the welfare state is a widely held view, and those who receive national assistance are readily identified with

a "racketeer" class, engaged in some sort of criminal activity, living a life of enviable luxury and driving from brothel to night club in brightly coloured cars. Any reduction of property values associated with coloured residence in a particular area provokes the same aggressive response.

The terms "Commonwealth citizen", "coloured gentleman", "colonial cousin" are now part of the colour vocabulary, invariably used in a mocking, sarcastic, tongue-in-cheek manner, implicitly defined as the language of the liberals, the politicians, the do-gooders, the ones who tell you that prejudice and the feelings that you have are wrong. To suggest that immigrants are Indians or Africans or Pakistanis is met with the cry, "How can you tell where they come from?" It's easier to call them wogs.

Comparative intelligence ratings between white and black are rarely denied in an absolute sense—the occupational status of doctor or lawyer is high, independent of colour, individuals who are black can be as intelligent as individuals who are white in this narrow academic sense. When intelligence is socially defined as the ability to solve more or less successfully the problems of living in a particular society, the situation is much different. The electrical engineering apprentice who found that a Pakistani had put the earth wire of his radio set into a jam jar full of soil, has been presented with an example which he defines as innate stupidity, not as lack of knowledge.

It is also possible to admire individual jazz and pop musicians and coloured entertainers, buy their records, go to their concerts, and still think that the coloured peoples in general have nothing to offer the rest of mankind. There can be sympathy to particular individuals without a feeling that sympathetic tolerance should be generalised and felt towards whole peoples.

Examples of the expression of intolerance could be multiplied and they only illustrate the obvious—that prejudice is irrational and is rarely modified by logical argument because rational techniques are always ineffective with those who have never learned or been taught to appreciate that a rational conclusion is a more valid base for an opinion than an irrational one. Attitudes on colour, then, become a particular example, or a result, of a culturally determined way of dealing with the world around us.

To change the context of the discussion for a moment: Is it possible to argue that apart from any feelings that are held, one can be persuaded that hanging people by the neck until dead is an inefficient way of dealing with murder in society because empirical evidence produces this conclusion? I think it is—because one has accepted as the result of experience that a particular method of interpreting data presented is more reliable than any other.

The ability to solve problems by rational techniques involves a fairly subtle manipulation of ideas and language and this may be, as Bernstein's research suggests, related to one's class position. That is to say, different classes have different attitudes towards the use of language as a problem-solving device. The structure of working class

language does not lend itself to the rational solution of problems by verbalisation, the structure is not sufficiently complex—it consists largely of predictable "set phrases" and is incapable of carrying out logical analyses. In general, language and its structure have never been regarded as of much relevance to the educational, occupational and cultural experience of the manual worker.

This is most relevant because the form of expression is the one common characteristic of the classroom discussions about colour. The phrases are all "set pieces" with very little individual contribution by the speaker. The boy in class who receives the applause of his listeners is the one who can combine the phrases and the jokes about colour into a witty permutation, or can deliver them in an amusing and effective way. It is very difficult to introduce "evidence" about colour into the discussion because the structure of the arguments which the class uses does not permit any rational consideration of data.

If this speculative theory is acceptable, does it provide any answers that will ease the problem of integration? Can people be educated away from prejudice or at least towards a greater tolerance than their statements about colour suggest? If it is assumed that they can, then one is assuming that feelings are amenable to rational control and a statement such as "I have no *evidence* that coloured people abuse the welfare state, therefore what I feel about them might be based on misinformation. If it is, I shall change that feeling", becomes a possibility. If this is considered a desirable and attainable end, then our educational system ought to be directing much of its time and effort towards instruction in rational techniques of argument and opinion construction.

A major difficulty here is that by the age of seventeen or eighteen it may be too late to introduce a new method of evaluating the environment, that is, to replace a largely emotive by a predominantly rational technique. This would be particularly difficult where the phraseology and the thoughts about colour have become so stereotyped and hardened that they form, as suggested earlier, a significant part of a working class folklore and mythology.

What are the difficulties involved in attempting to teach a rational technique of opinion formation? Continual emphasis in the classroom throughout the year that the methods of argument must be based upon scientific method, is only partially successful. One can demonstrate the applicability of observation, hypothesis construction, experimental testing and law making, to the natural sciences, much more easily than to the social sciences because there is no emotional involvement with, for example, the fact that metals expand when heated, whereas there is with the presence of coloured people in the community.

A related difficulty is that many of the attitudes towards colour are expressed in terms of "I believe" statements, or "I feel" statements, which must, of course, continue to exist outside of the "I know because I have evidence" statements, that belong to the empirical approach. Pessimistically interpreted, this means that it may be possible to chip away some of the misinformation, but that a great

block of anti-colour feeling remains—this of course is the perennial problem of the rationalist. It does remain reasonable to assume, however, that a wider adoption of the rational technique and an acceptance of its validity at least reduces the range over which prejudice can operate and can destroy some misconceptions about colour, and indeed about many other social issues. It is better to offer a critical apparatus and technique for dealing with information and reaching conclusions, than simply to hand out a "be kind to the wogs" philosophy which can so easily be the interpretation that a class will place upon the teacher's role in discussion about coloured immigrants.

The white problem in Rhodesia

JEREMY WESTALL

THE DIFFICULTY ONE FINDS in assessing the likely future of Rhodesia leads one to look at a more certain aspect of the scene, namely Rhodesia's past. Even here there is much room for disagreement, but a brief look at Rhodesian history is essential to an understanding of the present situation.

OCCUPATION

In 1838 a branch of the Zulu tribe, the Matabele, crossed the Limpopo River which now divides Rhodesia from South Africa, and conquered the Mashona people in the area between the Limpopo and the Zambezi River. The Mashona, now thought to have been the tribe most involved in the ancient civilization in Central Africa centred round Zimbabwe, were no match for the warlike Matabele. When Europeans first came to the area between the Limpopo and the Zambezi—called then Zambesia—they therefore came upon the Mashona tribe subjugated by the Matabele and the justification given by some early white settlers for their incursions into Central Africa amounted to the claim that they acted to protect the Mashona from the Matabele. We will see whether such altruism really drove the white settlers as we tell our tale.

The European who bears the name of Rhodes—Cecil Rhodes—was a diamond millionaire from South Africa. A megalomaniac and sexually impotent, he was driven by a lust for riches and power to venture into Zambesia in search of the legendary gold mines as depicted in "King Solomon's Mines". Rhodes' agent whom he sent to Zambesia, one Rudd, sought out the Matabele Chief, Lobengula, so that Rhodes could move into the area "legitimately". It was in 1888 that Rudd acquired a Concession from Lobengula, always known as the Rudd Concession, to "dig holes for gold" in the areas where Lobengula ruled. In return for this Concession, Lobengula received £100 a month, a

thousand rifles, and the promise, never discharged, of a steamer for trips on the Zambezi.

It was in 1949 that a settler in the Northern Rhodesia Parliament, one Roy Welensky, stood up and asserted that Lobengula was drunk at the time he gave Rudd the Concession and that he did not know what he was doing. "There was no law or custom," Mr. Welensky continued, "among the Matabele permitting the sale or giving away of land. When the Rudd Concession was granted, no chiefs from the Mashona tribes were present. There was no intention of giving any land except that which was needed for the purpose of taking and getting gold."

However it was good enough for Rhodes to set up a Pioneer Column from South Africa to enter and occupy Zambesia. In 1891 Lobengula tried to stop Rhodes by granting the sole right to dispose of land in the region to a German named Lippert. But Rhodes bought Lippert out and "regulated" the process of land acquisition carried out by the Pioneers.

This led to the 1st Matabele Rebellion of 1893 when, in two major battles, hundreds of Matabele were mown down by Maxim guns and four settlers were killed. The rifles, which had been given as a bribe to Lobengula, were useless because Lobengula's men didn't know how to use them. Lobengula was chased by a band of Pioneers but died before he was captured. Some claim he was poisoned.

The Chief of Staff of the Campaign claimed that the need to fight the Matabele "originated in a manful determination to deliver the Mashonas, over whom the white man's protecting arm had been extended, from the assegai of the Matabele." Yet in 1896 the Matabele rebelled unsuccessfully again and the Mashona peoples rebelled with them. It could also have been a promise of land for the Pioneers given by Rhodes before they set out that impelled them to mow down the Matabele in savage barbarism.

Zambesia became Southern Rhodesia as a project of Rhodes' British South Africa Company. He paid all the bills for the administration of the country. He extended the concepts of South African rule into Central Africa. It was a settlers' enterprise with the chance of gold and land as the bait. And there was something else as well . . . the women of the conquered peoples who were raped and used to allay the lusts of the men who had extended a "protecting arm" to save the Mashona from "the assegai of the Matabele". As a settler, Mr. Max Buchan, said in 1957, "The conqueror considered, in many cases, that one of the fruits of victory was the women of the conquered race."

CONSOLIDATION

With Southern Rhodesia occupied and ruled by right of conquest, Rhodes' administration, the British South Africa Company, kept charge of affairs until the 1920's. The settlers had their own Council between the last years of the 19th century and the 1920's, but they were outnumbered by Company men, a fact which they resented.

But in 1922 Southern Rhodesia became a self-governing colony

and after a referendum of the white population it separated itself from that any Acts of racial discrimination could be vetoed by the British Government. Southern Rhodesia was now practically independent and the settlers now ruled, not the British South Africa Company.

The seriousness of the British threat to veto discriminatory legislation is best considered with the passing of the Land Apportionment Act in mind. The all white Parliament of Southern Rhodesia passed this Act in 1930 and it became the basis of the social order. It segregated the two main races of Southern Rhodesia into two areas. The white settlers were apportioned about 50 per cent of the land—the best land, served by railways and roads. The Africans were to be apportioned certain protected areas where the land was generally of poor quality, far from the rail, and served by poor roads.

This blatantly discriminatory Act was, needless to say, not vetoed by the British Government. The settlers built up their own civil service, their own police force, army and air force. Unlike any other colony, Southern Rhodesia had broken away from Whitehall whilst keeping the resemblance of colonial status.

After the 1939-45 War, the idea grew in Southern Rhodesia of some association with Northern Rhodesia. The gold which the early settlers had searched for in Southern Rhodesia was never found but another important commodity had been found in Northern Rhodesia—copper. This copper made Northern Rhodesia potentially rich and the Southern Rhodesians were lured towards the concept of an economic association with Northern Rhodesia.

Eventually the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland came into being in 1953. Nyasaland was included in the Federation as it supplied a fair percentage of the labour force in both the Rhodesias. The Federation was created to supply Southern Rhodesia with the benefits of the copper industry in Northern Rhodesia and it was opposed before its inception and throughout its existence by all African opinion in the two countries of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

The public relation angle on the ill-fated Federation was that it involved a great experiment in multi-racialism. The word partnership was used very often although it came into disrepute somewhat when the first Prime Minister of the Federation described the partnership between African and European as being analogous to the partnership of horse and rider.

The Africans in Southern Rhodesia hoped that the Federation might improve their position as the two northern territories were under the Colonial Office and they felt that the influence of the north might ease the discrimination in Southern Rhodesia. However, their hopes were soon dashed when a mildly liberal Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, one Garfield Todd, tried to extend the voting franchise to include a few thousand more Africans on the voters' roll. In 1958 the settlers ousted Todd from power in disgust and any liberalism was quickly stamped out. It was quite evident that anyone who did more than talk about partnership between the races was for the boot.

African opinion hardened towards Federation with the demise of

Garfield Todd and the momentum of the African nationalists in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland increased. To great cries of betrayal from the Federal Prime Minister, Sir Roy Welensky, the Colonial Office decided to acknowledge the African nationalist case and the Federation broke up during 1962 to be followed by African majority rule in Nyasaland, now Malawi, and Northern Rhodesia, now Zambia.

The reaction of the settlers in Southern Rhodesia to the break up of Federation, to the independence with majority rule of Malawi and Zambia, was bitter towards Britain. They demanded that they also should have full independence if blacks to the north had theirs.

But as Whitehall kept talking of majority rule as the price for independence in Southern Rhodesia, a determination grew up in the country to break away from Britain in order to have complete independence.

The moderate European Government led by Sir Edgar Whitehead was narrowly defeated at the polls based on the 1961 Constitution allowing 15 out of 45 seats to Africans. The party in power was the right wing Rhodesian Front led by Mr. Winston Field. The Rhodesian Front was determined to get independence without strings and without majority rule. As it became obvious that Field would not declare independence, a new man, Mr. Ian Smith, was put in his place by the Rhodesian tobacco farmers who controlled the Rhodesian Front.

The desire for independence grew in Southern Rhodesia and elections at the end of 1964 gave the newly established leader, Ian Smith, an overwhelming victory. All moderate European opinion was crushed and the settlers united behind the first Rhodesian Prime Minister of Rhodesia.

After trips to London to speak with the British Prime Minister and others, after trips by the British Prime Minister and others to Rhodesia, it became obvious that Smith was going to declare Rhodesia independent. Yet it still came as a shock to nearly everyone when he actually proved that he was not bluffing and declared Rhodesia independent on the 11th of November, 1965.

THE RHODESIANS

Who were these white settlers in Rhodesia who had backed Smith so strongly in his illegal act? They number 220,000 and are roughly 40% South African and 50% British with the odd 10% of Rhodesians born and bred. 30% of the South Africans are Afrikaans-speaking and their concept of racial segregation on the South African model is the generally accepted social ideal.

A correspondent in the *Observer* recently put the position very well, when he wrote: "We hear a lot about 'kith and kin', but White Rhodesians are much more akin to their neighbours in the south than they are to Britain. They think alike, they look alike and they speak alike. Even Mr. Ian Smith has a South African accent!"

"Rhodesia was established from the south, and the close affinity has never been lost. Even the Act of 1910, giving South Africa its independence, envisaged Rhodesia becoming the fifth Province. Today,

interchange of the two populations is continuous. Rhodesia gets its Roman-Dutch Law from South Africa."

My own experiences as related in the *University Libertarian* whilst doing Army training in Rhodesia in 1959 add weight to this view. This was before the latest swing to the right in Southern Rhodesia. I wrote: "It was when the Emergency had just begun, when every trainee was afire with a desire to 'kill some bliddy Kaffirs man', that our CO, a South African, gave us a little talk about the possibilities of killing 'munts', as he referred to Africans. He said he knew how eager we all were to get some action and wipe out a few munts, he thought this was a fine spirit and praised us for it. He advised us that if the time did come for action we should all be safe in killing as many munts as we could, however suspect the circumstances. It was better to kill than take prisoners. We were told, by our Commanding Officer, that we should ignore sentimentalists in Britain if they complained that we killed too many of their 'darling natives'.

"After the Emergency was over one incident of anti-semitism (one among many) occurred in the platoon with which I was being drilled. An Afrikaans corporal was drilling the squad. He shouted a command to halt and apparently a Jewish bloke halted badly. Van Zyl, the Afrikaans corporal, then let fly a long tirade of abuse at the Jew and he was ordered to leave the squad and stand with his face away from the parade ground, standing stiffly to attention. Another Jew, to his credit, complained at this anti-semitism and Van Zyl ordered him to stand with his friend. And they remained, humiliated, for a full thirty minutes."

White Rhodesians, speaking for themselves, are very enlightening. A letter that appeared in the *Rhodesia Herald* from Oom Louis reads: "Sir,—Surely any person regardless of age, colour or sex, convicted of stoning any car, should be regarded as a murderer. Such a person so convicted should be summarily sentenced to death, without any option even of appeal, and the sentence carried out forthwith and in public."

Another example of Rhodesian culture is provided by the *Telegraph* supplement on Settlers recently. It is discussing the Rhodesians and refers to a typical Rhodesian family—the Wildes—recommended to the *Telegraph* as a typical settler family by the Rhodesian Government Information Office. "Mr. Wilde owns three tobacco farms and lives in semi-retirement with his wife Betty eight miles from Salisbury."

Mr. Wilde explains: "I thought we were going to be handed over to the sausages so I left in 1960 and spent two years in England. I came back when things looked as if they might be better." His wife chimes in: "Blacks are responsible for all the trouble in the world. It's blacks, blacks, blacks. I'd shoot the lot."

Before finishing with the white settlers one should mention the small, brave band of white liberals. One of them, Mr. John Lentell, is looking after the children of an African and his wife, both restricted for five years without trial, Mr. and Mrs. Chinamno. There are five children and the hatred of the European population to contend with. He has had a petrol bomb put under his car for his pains.

THE AFRICANS

The four million Africans are of the Matabele and Mashona tribes but the real differences today are not tribal. The government-financed Chiefs who support Mr. Smith are of no real significance, for the vast bulk of the African population support either the political party of Mr. Joshua Nkomo, the People's Caretaker Council (PCC, once known as ZAPU) or of Rev. Ndabani Sithole's party, ZANU. The two political groupings have developed inter-party rivalry over the last three years resulting in violence directed by Africans against Africans.

In an article written from Rhodesia I wrote "These are sad days in Rhodesia. Days of destruction. Days full of shame, terror and tears. In the last two weeks there have been four political murders. One member of ZANU was set alight and burned to death by a gang in Highfield's African township, a youth—just yesterday—was stabbed in the neck and bled to death, Africans in their frantic fear and feeling of hopelessness are killing their fellow Africans."

The political parties in Rhodesia are now without leadership as all effective leadership is either restricted or out of the country. They have manoeuvred themselves into a very precarious position. This is due to the fact that they have developed revolutionary tactics—that is boycotting elections and non-participation in parliamentary affairs—whilst keeping a non-revolutionary reformist structure. If elections were held in Rhodesia with "one man, one vote", Mr. Nkomo would be returned to power, but when it comes to his supporters taking direct action, they fail. It is because they have not built a movement that is committed to revolutionary action. The African politicos assume that strikes are only caused by intimidating Africans into staying away from work. There is little encouragement involving pleas for solidarity in calls for strike action. The cry is "Nkomo has ordered a strike. You will stay away from work or get beaten up!"

Many Africans have turned their backs in disgust on the political parties. They are opposed to Smith but see the African nationalists as no better. One would be at fault if no mention were made of the many Africans who seek to build a better world without coercing their fellow Africans and who lay a stress on freedom rather than power. One of these is Mr. Lovemore Chimonyo who has said with a conviction I always find moving: "I believe in freedom, and I mean every kind of freedom: the right of everyone to say what they want, and go where they want, and do what they want, I've always felt this, strongly."

To show this belief in action Lovemore Chimonyo demonstrated. "Through the beery gloom in the saloon bar of a Salisbury hotel a black face appeared, others followed. Talking ceased. The all-white customers, mostly in open shirts or shorts gazed in surprise or horror. An old-timer, whom some claim hadn't moved from his stool this century, spluttered in his beer and staggered to the door.

"May I have a beer?" said the black face.

"Sure," said a gruff voice. "Have mine." And a hairy white arm shot out a full glass of beer—sploosh—in a direct hit.

"The black face of Lovemore Chimonyo glistened and the beer

ran rivulets down his beard."

THE CONTRAST

When I taught in Highfield African Township I travelled every day from the white town to the African Township and the overwhelming impression I always had was one of contrast between the large European houses with swimming pools, servants, cars, gardens and spaciousness, and the dusty, unlovely, crowded, garden-less African Township.

The average European in Rhodesia earns £1,200 per annum; the average African earns £100 per annum. An African pays £3 per annum for education costing £8 per annum. That is, he pays almost half. The European pays £9 per annum for education costing £40 per annum. That is under a quarter. Four million Africans occupy 50% of the land in Rhodesia, the other 50% is reserved for 220,000 Europeans.

Under the Law and Order Maintenance Act up till the end of 1963 only, 1,220 Africans were convicted and 2 Europeans. It is estimated that to date the number is roughly 8,000 Africans to 8 Europeans. Expenditure on housing for European railway workers is $12\frac{1}{2}$ times as much per capita as for Africans.

It is illegal for an African man to cohabit with a white woman. Offenders get five years' hard labour for breaking this law. It is an offence for an African man to even make "indecent suggestions" to a European woman. Yet it is not illegal for a white man to cohabit with an African woman. Making "indecent suggestions" is part of the back street life in the city of Salisbury.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

The position now is difficult to assess clearly because we are not certain about the reaction of the Rhodesian whites. When sanctions begin to bite, some believe the unified European electorate will split between Mr. Smith and a more moderate white leadership willing to compromise with both Britain and the African nationalists. It is also uncertain whether Britain will be prepared to continue with the already stiff, or stiffer, sanctions.

Those who consider that Smith will not get away with UDI tend to follow the argument as expressed in the *Observer* in an article "Will Wilson Give Up?" "Any sell-out to Mr. Smith by Britain (no matter how cleverly disguised)", the article runs, "would be seen by the rest of the world's Governments as a sell-out to Dr. Verwoerd and the other white supremacists of Southern Africa. Certain consequences would follow.

"Perhaps not all the African members would leave the Commonwealth, but the majority of them would. In India's present mood towards Britain after the Kashmir crisis, and because of her urgent need for Afro-Asian friends, she would, too: that is more than a probability.

"An apparent British surrender to white supremacists in Southern Africa would, of course, offer the Communist countries a political feast. Even if the Russians hesitated to exploit this opportunity too openly, for fear of upsetting their current negotiations with America over nuclear proliferation, they could not afford to stay out for long. To

stay out would be to give their Chinese rivals a free gift of all African and Asian good will. After all, Rhodesia is the gateway to Mozambique and South Africa, where changes will some day occur; and whoever brings them about will gain a huge political asset."

Those who consider that Smith will win through against all the odds, are usually, to my mind, serving their own wish fulfilment. Apart from right wing conservatives like Lord Lambton and Smith himself, there is no real body of opinion that believes Smith can win through. A few anarchists maintain that Smith must have carefully considered his position before declaring independence and that he must have thought he would win through. But he could also have miscalculated world reaction. The Communists maintain Smith and Britain are in collusion over Rhodesia but this seems unlikely. British sanctions have hurt far too much for this to be believed and even though Wilson might be considered quite likely to connive with the white racists (after all he has given away to them in his own party), it is unlikely that Smith would trust Wilson in any plan of conniving in UDI.

THE KARIBA DAM

The main source of electric supply in Rhodesia and for Zambia's copper belt is the massive Kariba Dam that bridges the Zambezi River, the natural boundary between Rhodesia and Zambia for decades past. The hydroelectric power station supplying power is situated in Rhodesia and the controls are in Rhodesia. Thus it is that President Kaunda of Zambia has been concerned, as have the American copper companies, about the possibility of an electric power cut for Zambia by Smith's men, who control the power station. A recent act of sabotage on the route between the Dam and the Copper Belt accentuated the danger for Zambia and added weight to Zambia's request for British forces to take over the Dam site.

There are those who maintain that Smith will never interfere with Zambia's power supply and they point to Smith's assurances on the matter. Yet trusting Smith's word is even more naive than trusting the word of most politicians; he said quite categorically, for instance, that Rhodesia State of Emergency proclaimed shortly before UDI was nothing to do with plans for a UDI. But the *Daily Telegraph* editorially claims that "There is no question of this (cutting off power from Kariba) happening except in response to some hostile act on Zambia's part".

Mr. Bottomley, Britain's Colonial Secretary, has stated that he has reason to believe the Kariba Dam has been mined by Smith and it is not difficult for Rhodesia to claim that Zambia has already committed hostile acts as regards Rhodesia by allowing African nationalists to call for acts of sabotage in Rhodesia over Zambia Radio. Together with this we have the information supplied by Patrick Keatley of the *Guardian* in his book "Politics of Partnership" when he writes: "In 1962 I was one of five correspondents who lunched informally with someone I suppose I must refer to simply as 'a senior minister in Salisbury'. It was not an occasion for pulling out notepads, but one thing our guest said was so astonishing—and alarming—that I slid an envelope on to my knee and scribbled the words as he spoke them.

He had pointed out how well girded Southern Rhodesia is for a 'fortress' operation against any outsider—"at Kariba the power station is on our side, the south bank"—and so on. If it came to the crunch the Rhodesians would fight."

OIL

The United Nations' call for an oil embargo of Rhodesia has been thought a definite and immediate danger to Smith's regime. But the *Telegraph* correspondent, David Adamson, points to the weakness of oil sanctions. "They are bound to hamper the economy," he writes from Lusaka, "and a 100 per cent motorised European population if they are brought into force but, because of South Africa and Portuguese support for Rhodesia, they are unlikely to be very effective. Although the refinery at Umtali, in the east of Rhodesia, might have technical difficulties in switching from one type of oil to another, the importance of an oil embargo would be psychological rather than material."

Also Ian Aitken, writing in the *Guardian*, informs us that "Rhodesia's stocks of oil, originally thought to be as little as one or two months' supply at the most, are now known to be at least as large as six months' normal consumption.

"This information is understood to have reached London in the last few weeks, and certainly since the United Nations Security Council called for international oil sanctions against Rhodesia. It has created still greater doubts in Government circles about the effectiveness of oil sanctions."

PRESSES

The various pressures brought to bear on the British Government in the Rhodesian aftermath of UDI need to be looked at. The pressure from the Commonwealth is obviously an important factor if only because it is such a large potential market for British goods. Yet the ultimatum for the Organisation of African Unity to break off diplomatic relations with Britain by December 15th—agreed to but not carried out by all African members of the Commonwealth—was greeted with the remark that Britain was not going to be pushed around.

Internally Mr. Wilson has to please the leadership of the Conservative Party who obviously want Mr. Smith to succeed. The right wing Conservatives are openly pro-Smith but the body of Conservatives want weak ineffective sanctions which will give a show of disapproval without hurting the Rhodesian racists. The Conservatives, not having to keep in tune with international pressures, might well find it necessary to adopt a sterner line with Mr. Smith if elected to power.

Perhaps the most important pressure put on Wilson so far has come from no statesman, no politician, no member of the Commonwealth, but from Mr. Cecil King, editor of the *Daily Mirror*. As Nora Beloff put it in the *Observer*: "The Prime Minister's cautious acceleration of sanctions is intended to squeeze the Smith regime as fast as—but not a second faster than—British public opinion will accept. It therefore came as a shocking body blow last Friday when the *Daily Mirror*, which has the highest circulation of any daily paper and which

has consistently supported him on Rhodesia, suddenly splashed a dramatic 'Watch it, Harold' article, urging Wilson to stop pressuring Smith and to concentrate on matters nearer home." Wilson, not being pushed around, of course, saw the *Mirror* exclusively and announced "No bloodshed. No force". Mr. Grimond made the wry comment that a change of emphasis in British policy had not before, to his knowledge, been announced from the columns of a daily newspaper in an obvious move to placate its editor.

FORCE

"The risk of a shooting war in Central Africa is very real," writes Sir Edgar Whitehead in the *Sunday Times*. As a former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia from 1958 to 1962, Sir Edgar may well be in a position to know. Although President Kaunda, in advising Britain to crush the Rhodesian rebellion by force, has said that he thought this could be done without bloodshed he has said with reference to Smith that "A rebel is arrested, tried and shot dead" despite being, in the words of John Bulloch in the *Telegraph*, "A pacifist in the Gandhian mould". Mr. Smith has been very clear on his attitude to force. When asked "Would you shoot at the Union Jack?", replied: "Certainly. Anybody who comes to this country without any right to come here will see what happens to him."

The most vocal advocates of force seem to be pacifists. As William Rees Mogg observes in the *Sunday Times*: "One must distrust the extent to which this is a war advocated by extreme left wing pacifists, near-pacifists and non-combatants. People, most of whom have had little to do with the armed forces, are now rattling the sabre for the soldiers."

The consequences of the use of force by Britain or African forces would probably lead to a South African intervention which might lead to a "2nd Boer War". *The Citizen*, a Salisbury paper, claimed in 1964 that "A big part of South Africa's military might, enough to face any eventuality, is solidly behind Southern Rhodesia . . . if the future were to bring the country (S. Rhodesia) face to face with the threat of military interference, South Africa will not hesitate to throw its might on our side." And the South African *Rand Daily Mail* said that the struggle between the Rhodesian Government "touches the whole struggle of White people to retain power in a contracting area of Africa. If the Rhodesians defy Britain and get away with it, the White establishment in the Southern part of Africa from Mozambique across to Angola, will feel itself immeasurably strengthened. If the Rhodesians lose the struggle, a gaping hole will have been torn in the other wall of the White position here."

The prospects of a real showdown in Southern Africa between the white supremacists and the rest of the world is perhaps on the cards but the forces of Southern Africa may only find resistance of a military character from Africans unless some body of Europeans forms its own International Brigade. British troops would be unlikely to invade Rhodesia as the Army commanders just would not have it. It is also thought that Sir Humphrey Gibbs would resign if Britain used force.

A fact which encouraged Wilson to declare that force would not be used whilst he was in Rhodesia just before UDI.

According to the Air Correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*: "All experts agree that the Javelins (sent by Britain to Zambia) defence could be considered only as token and that Rhodesian jets could cross the frontier at will and return without possibility of interception." This seems to underline Britain's lack of determination to use force in Rhodesia—though the use of sanctions may well mean force is not needed.

The OAU has not enough money to wage a war in Rhodesia and insufficient equipment but a force could be sent to Kariba and could spark off a conflict which might bring Britain or Russia into the fray. The responsibility of Britain and the British people for Rhodesia and the Rhodesian people is clear. If the British Government does not use effective sanctions against Smith or back-peddles when they begin to really bite, or if the British Government will not use force to crush Smith should he survive sanctions, then the British people must act by forming an international force that will carry through the British responsibility in Central Africa.

Savagery starts at home

A. S. NEILL

I HAVE JUST BEEN RE-READING your *Lord of the Flies* number (ANARCHY 48). I wish I had known you were doing it, for I could have given a criticism from an angle different from those published by you. People ask me: "Doesn't Golding's book show that your views on children are all wrong?" On the contrary, the book shows that the views of the Establishment are all wrong. Let me quote from an article I had in *The Teacher* (a journal run with skill and brightness by Nicholas Bagnall):

William Golding's book *Lord of the Flies* has had a large circulation and the film of the book will be seen by millions. And thousands will cry: "I knew it. I knew that boys were born in sin and become civilised only because we disciplined them and led them to higher things."

I fear that too few will ask whether boys on a desert island really would become savages and sadists; few will wonder how Golding can know how boys would behave. Naturally he doesn't, any more than you or I know.

I have never met him and can only guess that he is a schoolmaster who believes in discipline from above and in original sin. He may be right about his boys and their island but I think he is completely wrong in his analysis of motive.

Take any group of boys. Mould them from the cradle days. Suppress their natural energy and curiosity by loads of stupid school subjects, by moral talks, by religious training, by punishment—in short pervert their young lives—and I guess that a few of them, when free from adult authority, will paint their faces and possibly kill each other.

It is significant that some of his boys were choirboys, trained in a religion that they could not fail to notice was not practised by their parents and teachers. All their instincts were suppressed. It would not surprise me to know that they went savage, for any free dog when chained up will become savage.

To me Golding's book is a proof that our way of training children is wrong and dangerous. His sick island is, in miniature, the sick island we call Great Britain. Our Mods and Rockers are the equivalent of his nasty little boys, full of hate because suppression must breed hate . . . of the American Negroes, the South African natives. Whether he knew it or not, Golding has condemned our whole system of education, and this is not theory; it is a belief founded on half a century of practice. Golding might have introduced at least one girl to soften the hateful hearts, but a girl would have spoiled his pet thesis—that boys are born original sinners and can only be saved by the stern discipline of grown-ups. I hasten to add that some suppressed school-girls might also have joined the hunting gang. Golding has studied the wrong children. Presumably he has never seen children who were free from outside moulding, children who got love instead of hate, children who had natural charity and tolerance. He has not seen, as I have for over 40 years, juries of children trying a young thief. Never once was any punishment demanded, only paying back.

TV has shown us pictures of white pupils stoning black ones in Little Rock, with faces full of hate and cruelty. According to Golding's theme these children are showing a natural innate savagery, a theme that does not fit into the fact that when a coloured child comes to my school even the youngest never seems to notice the colour. And this is not only true in my school, but in many a co-ed school, indeed any school in which hate in the form of authority does not rule.

I mentioned Mods and Rockers. Let us try to make a comparison between them and Golding's little terrors. Both suffered the same education, which in the main meant boredom and dislike of all the futile factors in schools—tables, sums, equations, dates, exports of Brazil. The school hardly ever dealt with emotional things, hence of course the thousands of screaming Beatle fans. The school and home of his boys were actively or passively against young life. Sex was made dirty and sinful. Violence, in the form of spanking at home or caning at school, prepared youth for the horror comic and horror film.

The moment a Mod or Rocker leaves his secondary modern school he is in the position of Golding's boys on their island; he is free of the whole hated school set-up. He can at last be himself. And he becomes himself . . . a poor fellow with starved emotions, without any culture, with his imagination perverted. He feels inferior; at school he was poor in his classes; his ego never had any chance of being respected

or even recognised. But on a motor bike with a bird behind, a bird starved like himself, he is a big man. And to prove it he kicks another big man in the face at Clacton. And all authority can do is to fine him £75, thus making him a hero. The suppressive forces made Golding's islanders and Clacton's toughs—and the punitive forces, in the form of fines and detention, must make the tough guys tougher.

True, the islanders, under the leadership of Ralph and Piggy, try to be a community with self-government, but the tough Jack, the Hitler, seizes power, a circumstance that would not be likely to take place among children who were free from adult moulding. In my own school the leader type is not followed unless I get a few new boys from disciplined schools and one of them is a leader. Pupils who have been in the school for—say—three years never follow any leader, and I make the guess that if they were marooned on an island, community government would persist. One big difference between Golding's boys and my boys and girls is that his boys have no interest in the little 'uns; they don't even know their names, whereas my older ones always have a protective attitude to the younger ones.

It may be significant that the dictator Jack is the head boy of the choir, head of the lads who were taught to praise a God who is the super authority above all the little authorities who suppress young life. I think here of the many barbarisms committed in history by the holy men of the past, including John Calvin who had a rival rebel priest roasted alive over a slow fire.

Golding's island is not only "full of noises": it is full of fear and terror. Any child, any adult on a desert island would know fear, but I fancy that only those who had been taught to hate and fear life would express their fear in blood and murder. To go back to a comparison between the islanders and my own school, I want to point to a difference. Childhood is playhood, and children never get enough play. My pupils, who can play all day and all year, live out their fantasies. True, these are conditioned by environment—TV and film stories of blood and thunder.

The victim of adult discipline never has the opportunity to live out his play fantasies in symbolic form, and that may be the reason why millions glory in watching boxing or football. The hate shouts at football matches come in the main from men who never play football, but football is only a game; it is not play. The little islanders were reared on cricket and football, not on spontaneous play. The working-class Piggy, who possibly never played any games, is the only one of the boys who shows intelligence and initiative.

I grant that the book is well written, often beautifully written. The characters, barring the little 'uns, live. Golding the novelist is good, but I aver that Golding the child psychologist is conventional, establishmental, backward-looking. Freud, Homer Lane, Aichhorn, might never have lived. The book could well have been written decades before child psychology came on the map. The nasty thought remains—some boys could form a Gestapo in certain circumstances. Golding holds that this is natural when adult authority is abolished.

I say, and I think that my work has proved it, that the absence of adult authority leads to kindness, charity, tolerance.

But the larger question: Why does man make a sick society? I cannot answer, just as I cannot answer the question why adults—parents, teachers, clergymen—have the nerve to tell a child how to live. It looks as if man puts his God in the skies for Sundays, while on weekdays he makes himself a little tin god. But it seems clear that Golding has shown one thing—that an imposed morality is only skin deep.

More heat than light

COLIN MACINNES

VICTIMS OF OUR FEAR edited by Tina Morris (Screeches Publications 2s. 6d.)

IT GIVES SUCH A WARM GLOW to write against racism that often your words have more heat than light. What's nice about this anthology is that it's multi-racial, international, and its authors young. What's disappointing is its banality.

To begin with the quotes. Those from libertarian prophets of the past are too familiar; while of those from the present, even a fine speech like Nelson Mandela's, is too well known. As for the racialist snippets, they're too silly to be worth repeating. (We all know what Colin Jordan "thinks": we should much more be watching what he *does*.)

Of the essays, the longest, on Malcolm X, comes from Arthur Moyse. This wraps up poor Malcolm who becomes in it a sort of coloured Jordan. Well, I agree with Arthur Moyse's critique of Malcolm's ideas, yet how is it every coloured militant I know of speaks of him with respect? It wasn't *all* destructive, was it? Incidentally, what Moyse calls "the hysterical prose" of James Baldwin, I see as passionate rhetoric. Are those three collections of essays, with their measured, painful analysis, really just hysteria? And by the way, the Negro intellectuals are far from being, as Moyse supposes, "spear-headed" by Baldwin's prose (hysterical or otherwise), since many of them regard him as one who writes too exclusively for whites.

The poems are rather better—though usually, I fear, when emotional, wallowing in self-indulgence. When they're satirical they're sharper, as Mari Evans' celebration of her being given, as a symbol of her being the New Negro, the "key to the White Locked JOHN".

So I'm sorry to be disparaging, but this number, in general, seems impeccable in sentiment, but woefully lacking in attack. Having taken up a positive position on racism, it is fine to shout in slogans, but even better to think and feel more deeply as to how it can be combated.

Otherwise this anthology is like those of hymns which are resounding in themselves, but are sung only by the faithful, play to empty churches, and win few human souls.

Martin Buber and the voluntary society

ROY WALKER

WRITING ABOUT MARTIN BUBER in the August issue of ANARCHY, John Ellerby said that, besides being a Jew in the racial sense

Buber was also a Jew in the religious sense: in fact he was world-famous as a religious thinker who transcends the limits of any particular faith. (Though he remarked in a television interview, "I must confess I don't like religion very much.")

The non-religious reader who wishes to be assured that he can take what he wishes from what Buber had to offer—and that was much—might seize on the "transcendence" and on the parenthetic lack of enthusiasm for "religion" and happily read on. But the reflective reader might wonder in passing how someone achieves world-fame as a religious thinker while not liking religion!

Mr. Ellerby is hardly to be criticized for not recalling the context of a BBC television interview that he happened to see on 14th December, 1961. But it so happens that I have a transcript. Buber was answering the Rev. Vernon Sproxton. "I'm thinking of religious groups," Sproxton had said, "particularly of your own people and from what you know of the Christian church—do these have the marks of a religious community upon them, do you think?" Buber did not try to let the good cleric down too lightly:

First of all I don't really know what "religious people" means. I must confess that I don't like religion very much and I'm very glad that in the Bible the word is not to be found. But—oh, I even think that nothing from the world is so apt to mask the face of God as religion is, if it means religion instead of really God. What the Bible says to people—or that people should simply become—it's not a religious toy, it means simply—that everything, social, economical, political life, not only private life, all that should be subjected to the kingly rule of God . . .

Buber's dislike of "religion" is not a dislike of the (Hebrew) Bible or God, it is a dislike of institutions that divide life into the sacred and the secular and limit their activities to the former. "He transcends the limits of any particular faith" in the sense of really having something to say to modern man of any faith or none in all or any of his situations, but not in having a detachable "philosophy" that one may cream off,

leaving the fact that he happened to be a Jew personally to whom it may concern. All life, he held, "should be subjected to the kingly rule of God . . ."

Readers of ANARCHY may feel that the missing context does indeed make these points. They may also feel it does so at the price of their interest in Buber and all his works. "Subjected" indeed! And, what's more, to "kingship rule" of a deity in whom they probably do not believe and are not interested. But before they exercise their freedom to turn to another article more to their liking, they may at least like to know that on this basis Buber launches an attack on social coercion far more outspoken and sweeping than any that Mr. Ellerby quoted in his article. This occurs in a reply to a circular question, "What Are We To Do About the Ten Commandments?" (another word to which anarchists are allergic).

Now human society, and by that I mean the living community at any definite period, as far as we can recognize the existence of a common will in its institutions, has at all times had an interest in fostering and keeping the Ten Commandments. It was, to be sure, less interested in those commandments which refer to the relationship to God, but it certainly wants the rest to be kept, because it would not be conducive to the welfare of society if murder, for example, ceased to be a crime and became a vice. To a certain extent this holds even for the prohibition against adultery, at least as long as society believes that it cannot get along without marriage, and indeed it never has gotten along without it, not even in its "primitive" stages of polyandry and polygamy. And as long as society cares about maintaining the connection between generations and transmitting forms and contents in a well-regulated manner, it must respect the command to honour one's parents. The Soviet Union has proven that even a society built up to achieve communistic goals must care about honouring that commandment.

But how does society go about it?

It is understandable that society does not want to base so vital a matter on so insecure a foundation as faith—on wanting or not wanting to hear. So, society has always endeavoured to transfer those commands and prohibitions it considered important from the sphere of "religion" to that of "morals", to translate them from the language which uses the personal imperative to the impersonal formulation of "musts". Society wishes these commandments to be upheld by public opinion, which can to a certain extent be controlled, rather than by the will of God whose effectiveness cannot be predicted or counted on. But since even the security of opinion is not entirely dependable, the commands and prohibitions are once more transferred, this time to the sphere of "law", i.e., they are translated into the language of if-formulations: "If someone should do this or that, then such and such a thing shall be done to him." And the purpose of the threat of "such and such a thing" is not to limit the freedom of action of the law-breaker, but to punish him. God scorned to regulate the relation between what a man does and what, as a result of his doing, is done to him, by exact mathematical rules, but that is exactly what society attempts. To be sure, society certainly has the personnel which, at least in principle, has well-defined work to perform: the courts, the police, jailers and hangmen. Oddly enough, however, the result is still far from satisfactory. Statistics, for example, do not show that the death penalty has had the effect of diminishing the number of murders.

This denunciation of the "musts" of a rigged public opinion, of the "or-else" of legal sanctions, this dismissal of the very idea that

courts and police can make a society "good" should be more to the taste of readers of ANARCHY. And yet, Mr. Ellerby is right to say "Buber was hardly an anarchist".

Arguments between anarchists and others, if they get down to the root of the matter, will be about whether man is "good" or "bad". What makes Christianity so distasteful to many of us is its Pauline insistence that man is "bad" or at least "fallen". Grant that and all the rest of the argument for authority and coercion must follow, the only question being whether in any given case it is as well and fairly used as one can expect from governors who are themselves "fallen" too. Against this is the humanist dogma—it is a *dogma*, no less than the Pauline one—that man is "good" and all his shortcomings are to be put down to the ill effects of an evil man-made social environment. Grant that, and the anarchist proposal to abolish all controls and let society even up and harmonise by a process as natural as water finding its own level must follow. The trouble is that neither of these alternative dogmas carries much conviction with most people who re-examine them after the experience, of say more than half a life-time.

Buber's Biblical starting-point—Adam—"we are still Adam" he says) in his short book *Images of Good and Evil* avoids this false dilemma by finding in oneself "polarity", that is, potentiality for good or evil. It also finds freedom, man's essential quality, which denies that in one set of circumstances man must flow downhill into evil and in the other into good. Man may—must—choose. But what is the choice? This is where Buber's teaching differs from anarchism. Given real freedom to choose, anarchism argues, man will at least usually choose good; but by this he seems to mean, sometimes good, sometimes neutral. It does not matter what a man chooses to do, the argument runs, so long as he doesn't harm anyone else, and harming anyone else includes limiting *their* freedom. This certainly leaves the religious man free to follow his chosen way. Equally it leaves the non-religious man free to indulge in more than a little of what he fancies. But insofar as the anarchist is a non-religious man (he usually is), he is advising the religious man to have done with his disciplines, even if they are self-disciplines; they are, he says, based on a false idea of reality—and if the religious man will only consult his own inclinations and follow them (within the limits indicated) he will be happier in both the short and the long run.

For Buber there is no "neutral", there is always the choice between good and evil. And evil is not so much such things as theft and murder—which are rather extreme expressions of it—as something very like the atheistic anarchist's "good". We can and do imagine all sorts of fantastic gratifications, we have and loose all sorts of instincts and impulses. Insofar as we simply let the strongest of these have its way at any given moment we cease to be what, in modern jargon, is called "an integrated person". But if the alternative is to muster all one's powers into a composite unity and commit them to a more than personal purpose, how is that to be done and what purpose is worth it? To suppose that the generality of men, as distinct from a minority of

altruists and saints, are likely simply to choose the good of mankind is to return to that over-romantic notion of intrinsic human "goodness".

Buber holds that there is *no* answer to such a question other than the "religious" answer. But this answer is not an intellectual assent to some upprovable intellectual proposition, it is the answer of total experience honestly examined. Man can no more "integrate himself" than he can lift himself up by his own shoelaces. The very fact that part of him is observing or trying to influence another part positively guarantees that the whole person will not emerge. A man may become integrated in the service of something to which his own nature is at heart akin but which is also beyond himself and can be reached for. But that to which man's *whole* nature is akin is "infinite": to reduce the goal to, say, liberal humanism—excellent as that is—is to lose touch with the dynamic that mobilises the whole of life (and not, like "religion", only a part of it). What Buber means by this—the root of all his teaching—the reader must see for himself in Buber's own masterly writings.

Observations on Anarchy 57: Anarchism and crime

I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT on certain inconsistencies in Tony Gibson's article "Anarchism and Crime" (ANARCHY 57). After drawing attention—correctly I think—to the need to focus on the system rather than the individual deviant, he notes what he sees as two major points in Durkheim's theory of deviance:

- (i) that criminality is inevitable, and
- (ii) that punishment confers a special benefit on society by ritualizing the acceptable social norms (i.e. to use the jargon, deviance has a "boundary defining function").

Now Gibson dismisses the first point as being "only relatively true" by using the analogy of a badly organized factory where accident rates are not "inevitable". True—but the analogy is patently false because accidents, injury and death are not the same as, say, abortion, drug addiction and homosexuality—precisely because there is no consensus on the latter types of deviance: only under certain circumstances and by certain people are they defined as "criminal". Similarly in regard to the second point Durkheim might indeed be both "reactionary" and "wrong" but Gibson uses the same argument himself in seeing the legalistic invention of criminality implying "a machinery to perpetuate

vengeance, deterrence and reform (reform to the idea propounded by the ruling group)". The fact is, indeed, that some people do see punishment as having this boundary defining function. Note Lord Denning's remark in the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment: "The ultimate justification of any punishment is not that it is a deterrent, but that it is the emphatic denunciation by the community of a crime".

It is not enough to state that the layman's view and the more sophisticated functionalist view of deviance are "reactionary". This might be the right conclusion, but for the wrong reason. One must focus on more directly the one factor these viewpoints ignore, the factor of power: *who* does the defining? *whose* norms are being violated? Anarchists of all people should be aware of these issues.

London, N.W.3

STAN COHEN

and some further observations on crime and the law

WHILST NO-ONE WITH ANY PRETENSIONS towards anarchistic beliefs could disagree with the general tone of the ideas in ANARCHY 57, there are certain arguments connected with some of the contributors' attitudes to anti-social behaviour that will not stand up to close analysis.

Tony Gibson in "Anarchism and Crime" suggests that the "rational ideal of a society is not to outlaw deviant behaviour but to tolerate it". He is excessively scathing about "do-gooders and liberal reformers" out to humanise the prison system and "to 'adjust' the poor benighted criminals to respectable society". He says that anarchists can have no sympathy whatsoever with such a programme. But this is absurd. However much one may agree that criminality is a product of a rotten society and that treating the symptoms is not enough, it still remains fact that one *does* have to treat those symptoms.

Although one may admit that there are many borderline cases where one is not sure whether one has a right to say: "This behaviour is undesirable", there are many forms of deviant behaviour where even an anarchist, indeed *especially* an anarchist, must say a firm: "No!" Tony Gibson, as a psychologist, must himself realise that under no social system which is feasible within a very long time to come can obviously anti-social beings like the murderer and the rapist be entirely eliminated. It would be a very *irrational* society which would passively

tolerate such behaviour. Whether you would call the place where you confine them a prison, a hospital, a rehabilitation centre or whatever, it is clear that such people have to be restrained, by force if necessary, from committing anti-social acts. This is unfortunate, but failure to do it will exact a bigger social price than the price to an anarchist conscience of incarcerating them.

I think that with suitable understanding on the part of those who look after them, with suitable treatment and an absence of any deliberate recrimination, most people who habitually indulge in anti-social acts could rapidly be rehabilitated into the outside community. But these are aspects of reform. It is one thing to assert, as I would, that the attitudes of many reformers are mistaken, and that they are blind to the inadequacy of treating the symptoms without *also* treating the causes; but it is a very different thing to condemn reform per se. There is a very genuine need to "adjust" certain types of deviant to society. This in no way implies an uncritical acceptance of existing society and all its conformist prejudices. In fact I believe that it indicates something far more in keeping with the humanitarian attitudes one would expect from an anarchist, namely a belief in the essential worth of every individual, a desire to restore him, however disturbed he may be, to a condition in which he can derive the maximum satisfaction from living with his fellow men. It is fairly conclusively established that anti-social behaviour is a reflection of a sense of inadequacy in dealing with other human beings, an indication of a basic lack of integration, perhaps we might say "happiness", within the personality. That psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers should be concerned to remedy this, to awaken the deviant person to his ability to conquer these defects, should surely be something which any anarchist would approve.

I feel much emotional sympathy for Marshall Colman's article "Against the Law", and he makes many very valuable points, but I wonder if he too shares some of Tony Gibson's misconceptions. It is all very well to be against the Law as such, where the Law is simply an instrument contrived by those in power to maintain the stability of their own position. But to suggest that a society can exist without any laws whatsoever is rather a dangerous step. I would readily agree that a rule system of any kind, to have any value for the individual, has to be active *within* himself, but freedom is *not* the absence of law. Rather one could argue that law is an essential pre-requisite of freedom itself, for behaviour which is not in some sense rule-governed can only be chaotic. We call these rules "moral" when they relate to how we should treat other human beings as persons in our everyday behaviour. The psychologist Carl Rogers maintains that these moral laws are endemic in the individual, but argues that they can be suppressed by developing in an unsatisfactory environment. If Rogers is right, we can claim some sort of objective basis for moral laws. But even if he is not, we do not need to be psychologists or sociologists to realise that living in a society with other human beings imposes certain restrictions on our behaviour. This will be true of *any* society.

I cannot see how any society could maintain itself without admitting a law to the effect that one should limit one's own freedom at the point at which it impinges on the freedom of others. This is surely a fundamental belief of all but the most super-Stirnerite of anarchists. I will admit that it is a law with the most difficult of borderline cases, and that where it is difficult to be sure whether an action contravenes it or not, it is rational not to interfere. But equally clearly, when an individual's action has *obviously* contravened it, he has placed himself outside of society itself, and other individuals must take some steps to prevent him repeating it. (To this extent authoritarians may be partially right, though for the wrong reasons.) I make no suggestion that anyone is justified in punishing or despising such an individual—has any one of us the audacity to deny having broken this law himself? But it is clear that in such a situation some form of re-education or "therapy" becomes necessary if any individual repeatedly performs acts which seriously harm the freedom of others.

Some readers may recoil with horror at hearing such views stated by a professed anarchist, and I would agree that they are all too open to misapplication and abuse. The problems of successfully dealing with behaviour which can be shown, objectively, to harm the wellbeing of other people are quite immense. Yet until we discover a satisfactory answer to them, anarchism will remain just an empty ideal. It is all too easy to pretend that come the revolution all our difficulties will evaporate without anyone lifting a finger. But if no-one is prepared to tackle them now, even if it means being labelled "reformist", there will never be a revolution.

Bristol

IAN VINE

IN NEXT MONTH'S ANARCHY: SYNANON & ANARCHISM AND RECOLLECTIONS OF THE PECKHAM EXPERIMENT